NIC Research on Small Jail Issues: Summary of Findings

December 2001

National Institute of Corrections

Morris Thigpen, Director

Ginny Hutchinson, Chief
Jails Division

Dave Pacholl, Correctional Program Specialist
Project Monitor

National Institute of Corrections
Jails Division
1960 Industrial Circle
Longmont, CO 80501
Toll free (800) 995-6429
(303) 682-0382

NIC Information Center
1860 Industrial Circle
Longmont, CO 80501
Toll free (800) 877-1461
(303) 682-0213

http://www.nicic.org

NIC Research on Small Jail Issues:
Summary of Findings

Project Staff:

B. G. Harding, Analyst
Constance Clem, Senior Editor

LIS, Inc.

National Institute of Corrections Information Center
Longmont, Colorado

December 2001

Contents

Project Method

The National Institute of Corrections (NIC) initiated a research project in June 2001 to explore, from a national perspective, current issues in small jail management. It was intended to cover some of the same territory as a study commissioned by NIC in the 1980s and published under the title, *Small Jail Special Issues* (Kimme Planning and Architecture; Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1986).

To begin the research, the NIC Jails Division and Information Center developed a survey form that was distributed to approximately 500 county jails identified as having a rated capacity of between 75 and 150 inmates. (The survey instrument is attached as Appendix A.) The survey covered issues ranging from staffing and operations to use of technology, as well as asking respondents to rate the difficulty posed by specific problem areas and their need for more space in the physical plant for specific functions. Data from 251 jails in 44 states were included in this report of survey findings.

Key Findings

Demographics:

- Rated capacities of these jails ranged from 36 to 193 inmates. The average rated capacity of responding jails was 101.

- The total of the average daily inmate populations (ADPs) reported by the 251 responding jails is 22,566, yielding an "average" ADP of 90 inmates.

- The combined total number of inmates booked by the responding jails in the year 2000 was 760,964, an average of 3,032 bookings per jail.

- Twelve percent (12%) of the responding jails reported an ADP for the year 2000 that was as much as 20 inmates over their rated capacities. In 48% of jails, however, the year's ADP was under their facilities' rated capacity. For single-day high counts, 39% reported a high count day during the year 2000 that was as much as 30 inmates over the rated capacity.

Facility characteristics:

- The majority of these jails (about 70%) were built, or underwent renovations/additions, in 1980 or later. Jails with new construction or an addition from 1990 to the present totaled 103.

- A combination of management styles is used in 61% of the responding jails. In 204 jails (82%), inmates are supervised by staff who make rounds past or through the housing units,

but in just 24% are rounds the only supervision technique. Visual surveillance from a control room or workstation is used in 55% of the jails. Thirty-five (35) jails, or 14%, use direct supervision, but just 5% of those surveyed use direct supervision as the only supervision technique.

Operations:

- At least 90% of the small jails surveyed are equipped with computers; just 16 jails, or 6%, indicated that they have no computers. Seventeen (17) jails are equipped with only one computer. Computerized booking systems are in use in 94% of the jails surveyed, and a linkage to other criminal justice related agencies is in place in 34%. Seventy percent (70%) of the jails have access to the Internet/World Wide Web.

- Fewer than half (38%) of the jails offer any type of industry, work detail, or job preparation programs. Substance abuse counseling/treatment is available in 62% of the responding jails, and educational programs are offered in 67%.

Needs and concerns:

- The most pressing issues confronting small jails include a lack of qualified candidates for hiring, inadequate funding for personnel and/or operations, staff turnover, contraband control, inadequate funding for the physical facility, difficulty managing special inmates, and crowding.

- Issues of greater concern in direct supervision jails compared to non-direct facilities include a lack of qualified candidates for hiring, inadequate funding for personnel/operations, crowding, and outdated technology/equipment. On the other hand, difficulty managing special inmates, inmate-on-inmate assaults, and escapes were of less concern in direct supervision settings than in small jails overall.

- Small jails reported that they are most likely to need more space for the following functional areas: records storage, general storage, disciplinary cells, and inmate property storage.

Use of NIC services:

- More than half of the jails (57%) had not received any form of NIC assistance at the time of the survey. However, 28% had used the NIC Information Center, 26% had participated in NIC training programs, and 20% had accessed information available on the NIC web site.

Section 1. Inmate Populations

Jails were asked to report a variety of data to describe their inmate populations and facility capacity in the year 2000.

- The jails reported a total of 573,618 persons booked, an average of 2,370 bookings per jail. (These are adjusted data—in a few agencies, the reported number of bookings in 2000 was roughly equal to these jails' ADP multiplied by 365; their data were excluded from these figures.) Responses ranged from 265 bookings in one jail to 7,620.

- The jails averaged an ADP of 92 inmates. The sum of the ADPs of the jails surveyed was 22,566 inmates. Reported ADPs ranged from 8 inmates to 350.

- The average rated capacity of the responding jails is 101 inmates. Rated capacities ranged from 36 to 193 inmates. The total of the rated capacities for responding jails was 25,291.

- Jails reported highest single-day inmate counts ranging from 13 to 370 inmates. The average single-day inmate high count was 118 inmates.

- On average, the jails in the sample were operating at or below capacity. (See also Crowding, page 4.)

Table 1. Overall inmate population data, 2000.

	Total Reported	Lowest Report	Highest Report	Average
Total bookings	573,618*	265	7,620*	2,370
Highest single-day inmate count	28,412	13	370	118
Average daily population (ADP)	22,566	8	350	92
Rated capacity	25,291	36	193	101

* Adjusted figures (see text).

Size of responding jails.

The largest group of responding jails (61%) had from 50 to 99 inmates.

Table 2. ADP of jails responding to survey.

	< 49 Inmates	50 - 99 Inmates	100 -149 Inmates	> 150 Inmates
Totals	20	150	56	18
%	8%	61%	23%	7%

Crowding.

Seventy-two percent (72%) of the jails reported an ADP under their rated capacity; on average, these jails were operating at 26 inmates under capacity. Twenty-five percent (25%) of the jails reported an ADP greater than their rated capacity; these jails were operating at an average of 35 inmates over capacity.

In the jail reporting the greatest difference between its ADP and its rated capacity, the ADP was 247 beds more than the rated capacity. In the jail reporting the greatest difference between its highest single-day inmate count and rated capacity, the inmate count was 267 inmates more than the rated capacity.

Table 3. Difference between jail ADP and rated capacity (N = 246 responses).

	<-50	-40- -49	-30- -39	-20- -29	-10- -19	-1- -9	0	1-9	10- 19	20- 29	30- 39	40- 49	>50
Total Jails	18	17	26	39	44	34	6	20	9	7	5	3	18
%	7.3	6.9	10.6	15.9	17.9	13.8	2.4	8.1	3.7	2.8	2.0	1.2	7.3

(Negative numbers indicate facilities operating under capacity; positive numbers indicate facilities operating over rated capacity.)

Single-day inmate high counts.

Roughly 60% of the responding jails (152) experienced a maximum single-day inmate count in excess of their rated capacity. These jails averaged 36 inmates over capacity. The greatest overage reported was 267 inmates over capacity.

In around 30% of the jails (81), the high count for the year was below their rated capacity. The highest single day inmate count (267 inmates) and ADP (247) were both reported by a jail with a rated capacity of 103.

Table 4. Difference, 2000 single-day high count and rated capacity (N = 241 responses):

	<-50	-40- -49	-30- -39	-20- -29	-10- -19	-1- -9	0	1-9	10- 19	20- 29	30- 39	40- 49	>50
Totals	2	4	11	12	24	29	6	31	39	24	17	13	29
%	0.8	1.7	4.6	5.0	10.0	12.0	2.5	12.9	16.2	10.0	7.1	5.4	12.0

(Negative numbers indicate facilities with a single-day high count below rated capacity; positive numbers indicate facilities with a single-day high count over rated capacity.)

Section 2. Facility Information

Age of jails in the survey sample.

The majority of these jails (about 70%) were built, or had an addition constructed, in 1980 or later. Jails with new construction or an addition from 1990 to the present totaled 103, or 41%. The earliest opening date for responding jails was 1939. Two jails were opened and three others opened new additions in 2000. Although the data compiled was for the year 2000, one jail noted an addition in 2001.

Table 5. Date facility or more recent addition opened, by decade.

pre-1960	1960-9	1970-9	1980-9	1990-9	2000-1
11	26	32	75	97	6

Jail construction status.

Two-thirds of the small jails surveyed have no current jail construction under way or planned. Approximately equal numbers have received approval for a construction project or have one under way, and are currently seeking approval for construction.

Table 6. Construction status of small jails, summer 2001.

	Responses	Percentage
New facility or addition approved or under construction	44	17.5%
Seeking approval for new facility or addition	42	16.7%
No current construction activity	164	65.3%

Among the jails that reported an ADP over their rated capacities (N = 62), a new facility or addition has been approved or is under construction in 22 jails (36%). Administrators in 17 of these counties (27%) are seeking approval for a new facility or addition. In the remaining jails with an ADP over the rated capacity, no construction activity was reported.

Of the 86 jails that were seeking or had won approval for a new facility or addition, only about half (39) were experiencing inmate overcrowding issues, based on a comparison of ADP and rated capacity. Forty-seven (47) others reported an ADP lower than rated capacity, but 35 of these jails reported a single-day high count significantly over rated capacity.

Responsibility for jail operation.

The county sheriff operates the jail in 82% of the counties surveyed. Shared jurisdiction between sheriff and county was noted in three cases. Responses in the category "other" included: Regional jail administrator (4); City/municipality (3); Chief of Police (3); Elected county jailer (2); Superintendent (1); Jail administrator/commissioner (1); Prison board (1).

Table 7. Jurisdiction for oversight/operation of jail.

	Responses	Percentage
Sheriff	206	82.1%
County	26	10.4%
State	7	2.8%
Private	0	0%
Other	15	6.0%

Juvenile detainees/offender populations.

Although 41 jails reported that they hold juveniles, only 36 reported an ADP for this population. Of those jails reporting a juvenile population for the year 2000, the juvenile ADP was 4.4, which accounted for 5.5% of the total jail population for these jails. Most jails reported juvenile ADPs in the single digits, but two jails reported ADPs of 20 and 35 juveniles, respectively.

Table 8. Small jail responsibility for holding juveniles.

	Responses	Percentage
Yes	41	16.5%
No	208	83.5%

Table 9. Juvenile inmate population, 2000.

Lowest count reported	1
Highest count reported	35
ADP, juvenile inmates, across all jails providing this data (N = 36)	4
Juvenile inmates as percentage of population in jails providing this data (N = 36)	5.5%

Special populations.

Small jails may be more likely than larger jails to board specific inmates populations with other agencies. However, nearly 50% of the responding agencies do not board any populations at outside locations. Juvenile offenders were most likely to be boarded elsewhere.

Table 10. Populations boarded out at other agencies.

	Responses	Percentage
Juveniles	61	24.3%
Women	58	23.1%
Sentenced misdemeanants	56	22.3%
Special prisoners	55	21.9%
None	125	49.8%

Housing of inmates for other jurisdictions.

Only 56 of the responding jails, or 22.3%, are not involved in a formal agreement to house some type of inmate for another jurisdiction. Half the responding jails have agreements under which they will house inmates received from other jails. Roughly 40% have agreements to house inmates for a state or the federal government.

Table 11. Inmates from the following agencies housed in responding jails:

	Responses	Percentage
Another jail or jails	124	49.4%
Federal governmental agencies	101	40.2%
State agencies	103	41.0%
None	56	22.3%

Computer technology.

Ninety percent (90%) of the jails in this survey indicated that they are equipped with at least one personal computer. Seventeen (17) jails, or 7%, are equipped with only one computer. Respondents from only 16 jails (6.4%) answered "no" to both questions about computer access. Staff have access to computers while on post in nearly all the jails that have computers (88.4%).

Seven respondents indicated that their jails were not equipped with personal computers but said that jail administration has access to have two or more computers. Two other respondents noted that inmates did not have access to "personal" computers. Because of the chance that other respondents did not understand the survey wording, the actual number of small jails with at least one computer may be higher.

Administrators in nearly two-thirds of the jails surveyed have access to the Internet, but in fewer than one-quarter of jails surveyed is the Internet accessible to staff on post.

Table 12. Computer and Internet access.

	Total	Percentage
Jails equipped with personal computers	226	90.0%
Jails with staff access to computers on post	222	88.4%
Jails in which administration has 2 or more computers	215	85.6%
Jails with only one computer	17	6.8%
Jails not equipped with computers	16	6.4%
Jails with administrator access to Internet	159	63.3%
Jails with staff on-post access to Internet	56	22.3%

Automated systems.

Computerized booking systems are in use in 94% of the jails surveyed, and the system is linked with other criminal justice agencies in more than 30%. Computerized mugshot systems are in far wider use in small jails (80.5% of the survey sample) than are computerized fingerprint systems (45.4%).

Table 13. Automation of jail functions.

	Total	Percentage
Jails with a computerized booking system	235	94.0%
Jails with a booking system linked to other agencies	79	31.5%
Jails with a computerized mugshot system	202	80.5%
Jails with a computerized fingerprinting system	114	45.4%

Communications technologies.

Just over half the jails surveyed can monitor or record inmate phone calls, and one-quarter have closed-circuit television systems available for court appearances. Fewer than one-quarter of the jails have access to satellite down-link equipment, either in-house or at another county building, library, or community college.

Table 14. Use of communications-related technology.

	Total	Percentage
Jails with system for monitoring or recording inmate phone calls	134	53.4%
Jails with closed-circuit television for court appearances	63	25.1%
Jails with access to satellite down-link equipment, in-house or other	55	21.9%

Section 3. Jail Staff Issues

Personnel figures.

For many agencies, survey data in this section were incomplete or did not provide clear numbers for total personnel and a corresponding breakdown into the three position categories provided. Based on data from 192 jails with complete answers, the jails averaged 31 staff members, including 75.

The number of correctional officers ranged from 4 to 89, totaling 4,495 in these jails. The data suggest an average of 24 officers per jail among the jails providing clear data.

Table 14. Breakdown of jail staff by position.

	Combined Total	Per Facility Average	Category as Percentage of Total Personnel
Total number of jail personnel (including all full- and part-time staff)	5,969	31.1	100%
Detention Officers	4,495	23.4	75.3%
Communication/Dispatch	223	1.2	3.7%
Others	1,250	6.5	21.0%

*Eight jails indicated that dispatchers can serve as the sole detention staff who monitor/ supervise inmates.

Two hundred forty-three (243) facilities provided the data necessary to compute the ratio of detention officers to inmates. Results range from 1 officer per 15 inmates in one Oklahoma facility to 1 officer per 0.8 inmates in a jail in California. A mean ratio of 1 officer to 4.6 inmates was found to exist overall. These numbers represent total detention officers per facility rather than detention officer positions per shift.

Position coverage.

All of the 250 jails responding to the question of whether a detention officer is on duty 24 hours per day, 7 days per week, not including dispatchers, answered in the affirmative.

One hundred ninety-two (192) jails, or 78%, have female detention officers on duty at all times when the jail houses female inmates. Six respondents marked the question as not applicable. Of the 53 jails replying in the negative, only six answered that they boarded out women prisoners.

Of the 71 jails signifying that they had dispatcher positions in their facilities, only eight (11.3%) responded that their dispatchers serve as the sole detention staff who monitor/supervise inmates.

Table 15. Detention officer position coverage.

	Responses	Percentage
Detention officer on duty 24 hours per day, 7 days per week, not including dispatchers	250	100.0%
Female detention officers on duty in jails housing female inmates	192	78.4%
Dispatchers serve as the sole detention staff who monitor/supervise inmates	8	11.3%

Use of sworn/commissioned officers.

Almost half the responding small jails (42.8%) reported that their detention staff includes both sworn/commissioned officers (officers with law enforcement powers) and non-sworn staff. In 22% of the jails, only sworn officers are used. Only non-sworn officers are used in detention in the remaining 35.2% of the small jails in this survey.

Table 16. Detention officer status.

	Responses	Percentage
Sworn officers	55	22.0%
Non-sworn officers	88	35.2%
Both	107	42.8%

Officer training.

Detention officers in the small jails surveyed most commonly receive training at a state training agency (77.6%), followed closely by training via a field training officer (FTO) approach (73.6%). Respondents were free to check more than one answer.

Table 17. Types of training detention officers receive.

	Responses	Percentage
State academy training	194	77.6%
On-site field training officer	184	73.6%
Other	105	42.0%
Facility does not have a formal training program	7	2.8%

Compensation.

In fewer than one-quarter of the responding jails, detention officers receive the same level of compensation (salary and benefits) as patrol officers. Most often, patrol officers receive greater compensation.

Table 18. Compensation.

	Responses	Percentage
Yes, there is parity in compensation	53	21.9%
No, patrol officers receive higher compensation	178	73.6%
No, detention officers receive higher compensation	4	1.7%
No answer	7	2.9%

Section 4. Inmate Management and Programming

Supervision methods.

Respondents were asked to indicate which supervision method they use for the majority of their inmate population. If their jails were evenly split between methods, respondents were asked to check those that are used. Table 19 shows the totals for each method, and Table 20 provides a more detailed breakdown of the surveillance method(s) used in the jails surveyed.

A combination of supervision styles is used in 61% of the responding jails. In 82%, inmates are supervised by officers who make rounds past or through the housing units, but in just 24% are rounds the only supervision technique used. Visual surveillance from a control room or workstation is used in 55% of the jails. Thirty-five (35) jails, or 14%, use direct supervision, but just 5% of those surveyed use direct supervision as the only supervision technique.

Table 19. Supervision method – totals.

	Responses	Percentage
Officer rounds past or through units	204	82.6%
Visual surveillance from control room or an outside workstation	135	54.6%
Direct supervision (officer post is within housing unit)	35	14.1%
Closed-circuit television surveillance	64	25.9%
No answer	4	1.6%

Table 20. Supervision method – breakdown of combinations reported.

	Responses	Percentage
Combination: visual surveillance and officer rounds	73	29.0%
Officer rounds only	61	24.3%
Combination: closed-circuit television and officer rounds	26	10.3%
Combination: visual surveillance, closed-circuit television, and officer rounds	24	9.6%
Visual surveillance only	21	8.4%
Direct supervision only	13	5.2%
Closed-circuit television only	3	1.2%
All other combinations	26	10.3%
No answer	4	1.6%

Frequency of rounds.

Those reporting that inmate supervision is accomplished through officer rounds past or through the housing units were asked to note the frequency of the rounds. The most common answer, from half of the agencies performing rounds, was 30 minutes. Fewer than 10% of jails perform rounds more frequently. In another 30% of jails, officer rounds are performed hourly. As indicated in Table 20, another form of supervision is used to supplement the officer rounds in all but 61 of these jails.

Table 21. Timing of officer rounds through housing units.

Rounds conducted every:	Responses	Percentage
15 minutes	12	5.9%
15 to 30 min.	2	1.0%
15 to 48 min.	1	0.5%
20 min.	4	2.0%
30 min.	101	49.5%
30 to 45 min.	2	1.0%
30 to 60 min.	5	2.4%
45 min.	4	2.0%
60 min.	59	28.9%
2 hours	1	0.5%
6 hours	1	0.5%
Non-routine	2	1.0%
No answer	10	4.9%

Documentation of jail operations.

All but one jail reported that written policies and procedures govern the operation of the facility. Similarly, in 94% of the jails inmates receive written rules of conduct and possible disciplinary sanctions.

Table 22. Documentation for staff and inmates.

	Responses	Percentage
Do written policies and procedures govern operation of facility?	248	98.8%
Do inmates receive written rules of conduct and possible disciplinary sanctions?	236	94.0%

Inmate programs.

Religious services and commissary access are each available in more than 90% of the jails surveyed. Roughly three-quarters of the jails provide library access. Another three-quarters operate community-based correctional programs, such as work or education release, day reporting, electronic monitoring, or weekender sentencing. Educational programs and substance abuse counseling/treatment are each available in more than half of the responding jails.

Fewer than half (38%) of the jails offer any type of industry, work detail, or job preparation programs.

Table 23. Programs offered to inmates.

	Responses	Percentage
Religious services	239	95.2%
Commissary	234	93.2%
Library	193	76.9%
Community-based alternatives to jail/intermediate sanctions (work or education release, day reporting, electronic monitoring, weekenders, etc.)	180	74.1%
Education	169	67.3%
Substance abuse counseling/treatment	157	62.5%
Industries, work details, or job preparation programs (not including work release)	96	38.2%

Recreation.

Inmate recreation is available outdoors in 71% of the jails surveyed and indoors in 61%. Outdoor recreation hours ranged from 1 hour to 105 hours per week, with an average 8.2 hours per week. Although 153 jails reported having indoor recreation available for their inmates, only 128 reported the number of hours of indoor recreation per week. Figures ranged from 1 hour to 126 hours per week, with an average of 4.8 hours per week.

Table 24. Access to recreation.

	Responses	Percentage
Jails with outdoor recreation	178	70.9%
Jails with indoor recreation	153	61.0%

Section 5. NIC Assistance

More than half of the jails (57%) had not previously received any form of NIC assistance at the time of the survey. However, 28% had used the NIC Information Center, 26% had participated in NIC training programs, and 20% had accessed information via the NIC web site.

Table 25. NIC assistance.

	Respondents	Percentage
No assistance	143	57.0%
Information Center resources	71	28.3%
Management, trainer, or specialty staff training	65	25.9%
Website information/resources	52	20.7%
Videoconference/distance learning participation	27	10.8%
Facility development or jail crowding assistance	19	7.6%
Other direct technical assistance	16	6.8%

A comparison of these figures with computer technologies used in the response sample suggests two areas in which NIC could focus some effort to expand the use of its services by small jails. Of the total respondents, 66% of the jails have Internet access, but only 21% have accessed the NIC website. Additionally, while 22% have satellite down-link capacity, only 11% have utilized NIC videoconference capability or distance learning programs.

Section 6. Potential Problem Areas

Table 26 presents results of a ranking by responding jails of several potential problem areas in jail management and operations. For each area, bold type indicates the most frequent response given. The most pressing issues confronting small jails include a lack of qualified candidates for hiring, inadequate funding for personnel and/or operations, staff turnover, contraband control, inadequate funding for the physical facility, difficulty managing special inmates, and crowding.

Table 26. Potential problem areas, ranked by overall level of concern.

	Very serious problem	Somewhat serious problem	Not too serious a problem	Not a problem
Lack of qualified candidates for hiring	26.9%	**33.7%**	28.1%	11.2%
Inadequate funding: personnel/ operations	27.3	23.3	**34.5**	14.9
Staff turnover	22.4	26.0	**36.0**	15.6
Contraband/contraband passage	12.4	28.8	**54.0**	4.8
Inadequate funding: physical plant	17.8	27.5	**34.8**	19.8
Difficulty managing special inmates	14.5	28.6	**40.7**	16.1
More inmates than beds (crowding)	21.9	21.1	25.5	**31.6**
Damage to jail property/vandalism	6.0	28.4	**50.8**	14.8
Inmate-on-inmate assaults	2.8	19.3	**70.3**	7.6
Lack of jail alternatives	9.8	22.4	**39.4**	28.5
Outdated technology/equipment	8.1	24.8	**35.4**	31.7
Inadequately trained staff	6.0	18.1	37.8	**38.2**
Suicides/suicide attempts	2.0	9.3	**59.7**	29.0
Lawsuits	1.6	11.3	**53.6**	33.5
Assaults on staff	0.8	4.0	**49.4**	45.7
Escapes	0.0	3.2	34.8	**62.0**
Fires	0.0	0.4	15.7	**83.9**

Section 7. Space Needs

Table 27 shows the percentage of jails that chose each of the available responses to describe their need for space in several functional areas identified in the survey. Five areas – records storage, general storage, disciplinary cells, inmate property storage, and interview rooms – were identified as the top space needs by the responding jails.

For each area, bold type indicates the most frequent response given. The mean score reflects an average of responses from all jails.

Table 27. Small jail space needs, ranked in order of need (mean score).

	Mean Score	Much too little	Too little	About right	Too much	Have no space/ Need some	Have no space/ Need none
Records storage	4.45	29.2%	**30.4%**	20.4%	0.0%	19.2%	0.8%
General storage	4.37	29.7	**31.7**	22.1	0.4	15.7	0.4
Disciplinary cells	4.15	23.8	**29.8**	29.4	0.4	14.1	2.4
Inmate property storage	4.14	23.7	**35.3**	29.3	0.8	10.8	0.0
Interview rooms	4.07	17.7	26.9	**34.5**	0.0	17.3	3.6
Detoxification/observation	3.97	17.3	27.3	**37.8**	0.0	14.1	3.6
Staff briefing	3.93	7.7	22.3	**42.9**	0.0	21.9	5.3
Attorney visiting	3.92	12.4	24.4	**47.6**	0.4	14.8	0.4
Booking/intake	3.91	11.2	24.4	**46.8**	1.2	15.6	0.8
Jail administration	3.87	15.3	29.3	**45.8**	0.0	9.2	0.4
Vehicle parking	3.85	16.5	21.0	**48.8**	0.4	11.7	1.6
Laundry	3.80	15.2	24.8	**48.0**	0.8	9.6	1.6
Kitchen/food storage	3.77	17.2	22.0	**44.4**	1.6	10.4	4.4
Counseling	3.73	13.3	27.7	**41.4**	0.4	10.8	6.4
Inmate programs	3.66	14.5	24.9	**41.4**	0.4	10.0	8.8
Medical care	3.65	10.8	20.4	**56.0**	0.8	9.6	2.4
Non-contact visiting	3.64	10.1	25.0	**53.2**	0.0	8.5	3.2
Typical cells	3.62	9.4	20.0	**60.8**	0.0	8.6	1.2
Control room	3.60	9.7	17.3	**58.5**	2.4	10.1	2.0
Indoor recreation	3.60	14.1	14.5	**46.0**	0.0	13.7	11.7
Inmate day space	3.56	9.6	19.3	**62.7**	0.4	6.8	1.2

	Mean Score	Much too little	Too little	About right	Too much	Have no space/ Need some	Have no space/ Need none
Vehicle sallyport	3.54	7.6	20.1	**58.6**	0.0	9.2	4.4
Outdoor recreation	3.43	9.2	10.8	**53.8**	1.6	12.9	11.6
Inmate worker housing	3.37	10.2	19.3	**48.8**	0.0	8.2	13.5
Staff lockers	3.35	11.6	19.3	**39.0**	0.0	22.1	8.0
Work release housing	3.04	7.4	16.4	**39.3**	1.2	9.0	26.6
Contact visiting	2.57	4.5	10.6	33.1	0.0	8.2	**43.7**

Appendix A

Problem Areas Compared by Management Style

The study sought to test the assumption that jails employing direct supervision as their method of inmate management would report fewer problems related to inmate control issues. However, only 13 jails of the 251 total respondents (5.2%) identified their surveillance method as being solely that of direct supervision. An additional 22 jails cited direct supervision along with one, two, or three other modes of inmate surveillance.

Findings indicate that direct supervision jails in the survey sample experience fewer problems with managing special inmates, inmate-on-inmate assaults, and escapes than do small jails overall. As shown in Table 28, concerns were also lower in some other categories, but to a lesser degree.

Areas causing greater problems in direct supervision jails compared to non-direct facilities were a lack of qualified candidates for hiring and facility crowding. Also of greater concern, but to a lesser degree, were funding for personnel/operations, outdated technology/equipment, and staff turnover.

The number given in the first three columns is a percentage score representing jails' level of concern about each item: overall, in direct supervision, and in non-direct supervision settings. The last column gives the difference between scores in direct and non-direct settings. Figures in (parentheses) indicate an area that is less of a problem in direct supervision; positive numbers indicate areas reported as being of greater concern in direct supervision jails.

Table 28. Problem areas in direct and non-direct supervision jails.

Potential Problem Areas	All Jails	Direct Super-vision Only	Other Manage-ment Styles	Difference, Direct & Other Styles
Inmate-on-inmate assaults	54.5%	38.5%	54.3%	(15.8)
Difficulty managing special inmates	60.3	44.2	60.0	(15.8)
Escapes	35.8	23.1	35.4	(12.3)
Inadequately trained staff	48.3	44.2	48.6	(4.4)
Suicides/suicide attempts	46.3	44.2	47.0	(2.8)
Damage to jail property/vandalism	56.3	53.8	5.65	(2.7)
Lack of jail alternatives	53.6	51.9	53.6	(1.7)
Fires	29.1	28.8	2.91	(0.3)

Potential Problem Areas	All Jails	Direct Super-vision Only	Other Manage-ment Styles	Difference, Direct & Other Styles
Assaults on staff	37.5	40.4	39.9	0.5
Contraband/contraband passage	62.4	63.5	62.3	1.2
Inadequate funding: physical plant	61.0	63.5	60.9	2.6
Lawsuits	45.1	48.1	45.4	2.7
Staff turnover	64.2	67.3	64.0	3.3
Outdated technology/equipment	52.5	57.7	52.2	5.5
Inadequate funding: personnel/ operations	65.8	71.2	65.5	5.7
More inmates than beds (crowding)	59.2	69.2	58.5	10.7
Lack of qualified candidates for hiring	68.9	80.8	68.3	12.5